



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,773	06/21/2001	Guy W. Bemis	VPI94-04DIV5	6928

1473 7590 09/24/2002
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
50TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

LUKTON, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1653

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/886,773

Applicant(s)

BEMIS ET AL.

Examiner

David Lukton

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 76, 102-107, 118 and 125-128 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 76, 102-107, 118, 125-128 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Pursuant to the directives of paper No. 2 (filed 6/21/01), claims 1-75, 77-101, 108-117, 119-124 have been cancelled, claim 76 amended, and claims 125-128 added. Claim 76, 102-107, 118, 125-128 are pending.

✱

A restriction is imposed, as set forth below. First, however, the following subgenera are defined:

G1: R₉ is an alkyl group which is not substituted with Ar₁.

G2: R₉ is an alkyl group which is substituted with both Ar₁ and oxo.

G3: R₉ is an alkyl group which is substituted with Ar₁, but the alkyl group of R₉ is not substituted with oxo.

G4: This genus is limited to the compounds of claims 102-104.

G5: This genus is limited to the compounds of claims 105-107.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

1. Claims 102-104, and 125, drawn to compounds and compositions, with the proviso that G5 is excluded,
2. Claims 105, 107, 125 drawn to compounds and compositions, which is limited to G1, and which excludes G2, G3 and G4.
3. Claims 105 and 107, drawn to compounds and compositions, limited to G2, and wherein

G1, G3 and G4 are excluded.

4. Claims 105-107, 118, 125 drawn to compounds, limited to G3, and wherein G1, G2 and G4 are excluded.
5. Claims 126-128, drawn to a method of using the compounds of Group 1.
6. Claims 126-128, drawn to a method of using the compounds of Group 2.
7. Claims 126-128, drawn to a method of using the compounds of Group 3.
8. Claims 126-128, drawn to a method of using the compounds of Group 4.

The claimed inventions are distinct.

Claims 105-107 have been divided into three Groups (Groups 2, 3 and 4). In the event that one of these three groups (Groups 2, 3 or 4) is elected, and determined to be novel, the possibility of rejoining either or both of the remaining two groups (of Groups 2, 3 and 4) will be considered. However, if either of the two remaining groups (of Groups 2, 3 and 4) is known in the prior art, rejoining (of the other two groups) is unlikely.

Inventions 5-8 and 1-4 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP

806.05(h)). Nevertheless, in the event that any of Groups 1-4 is elected, and claims therein found allowable, the corresponding method-of-use claims will be rejoined for further examination provided that the limitations present in the claims (drawn to compounds) are incorporated into the method claims [*In re Ochiai* (37 USPQ2d 1127)].

Applicant is advised that for the response to this requirement to be complete, an election of the invention to be examined must be indicated, even if the requirement is traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

. . . .

In addition to the foregoing, applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a disclosed specie for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. A "specie" is a specific compound, with all substituent variables fully accounted for. In the event that applicants elect one of Groups 5-8, election of a second species is required, namely a specific disease to be treated.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are witten in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 of the other invention.



Serial No. 09/886,773
Art Unit 1653

-5-

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 703-308-3213. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached at (703) 308-2923. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



**DAVID LUKTON
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1600**